



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,624	04/22/2004	Eric L. Barsness	ROC920030407US1	7304
46797	7590	09/18/2007		
IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			EXAMINER COLAN, GIOVANNA B	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/829,624

Applicant(s)

BARSNESS ET AL.

Examiner

Giovanna Colan

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is issued in response to the Amendment filed on 07/06/2007.
2. Claims 1, 17, 22, 38, 43, and 44 were amended. No claims were canceled. No claims were added.
3. This action is made Final.
4. Claims 1 –44 are pending in this application.
5. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims 1, 17, 22, 38, 43, and 44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
6. Examiner makes note that the current amended limitation of claim 38 recites "determining a degree of correlation..." in line 20. However, this newly amended limitation "determining" as opposed to previously limitation "computing" (as recited in previous amendment dated 01/18/2007) has not been underlined to follow the format of amendments.

### ***Specification***

7. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The limitation "to create a third column that..." recited in claims 1, 22, and 43 is not supported in the specification of the disclosure.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1 – 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandler et al. (Sandler hereinafter) (US Patent No. 2003/0217033 A1, filed: May 17, 2002) in view of Kaufman et al. (Kaufman hereinafter) (US 2004/0073565 A1).

Regarding Claims 1, and 22, Sandler discloses computer readable storage medium containing a program which, when executed, performs a process for identifying correlated columns from database tables, the process comprising:

determining correlation attributes for a first column and a second column from one or more database tables, the correlation attributes describing for each column at least one of the column and content of the column (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 12; wherein the step of mapping which includes all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806 corresponds to the step of determining the correlation attributes as claimed; wherein values F1 corresponds to the first column claimed; and wherein values in K1 corresponds to the second column claimed; Sandler);

comparing the correlation attributes from the first and second column (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 12, all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806, Sandler);

identifying similarities between the first and second column on the basis of the comparison (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 8 – 15, all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806, Sandler<sup>1</sup>);

on the basis of the identified similarities, determining whether the first and second column are correlated (Fig. 18A, Page 17, [0235], lines 8 – 15, "To perform this mapping, all of the values in field K1 1804 **that have the same values** in field F1 1806

Art Unit: 2162

must be combined...”; wherein “the same values” corresponds to the identified similarities claimed; Sandler); and

upon determining the first and second columns are correlated, merging the first and second columns to create a third column (Fig. 18A, Page 17, [0235], lines 8 – 15, “To perform this mapping, all of the values in field K1 1804 **that have the same values** in field F1 1806 must be combined...”; wherein “the same values” corresponds to the identified similarities claimed; Sandler).

However, Sandler does not explicitly disclose that the third column contains each data value stored in the first and second columns. On the other hand, Kaufman discloses merging the first and second columns to create a third column that contains each data value stored in the first and second column (Fig. 5B, wherein the column “SECURITY\_GROUP\_USER” corresponds to the first column claimed, the column “PEOPLE” corresponds to the second column claimed, and wherein the “USER” column corresponds to the third column claimed, also note that “USERS” column contains each data value stored in the first and second column, such as, “USERS\_KEY” and “PEOPLE\_KEY”; Page 8 – 9, [0134] – [0135], and [0139], Kaufman).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Kaufman’s teachings to the system of Sandler. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Kaufman (Page 1, [0011], Kaufman), to provide a comprehensive application through which the back-end

---

<sup>1</sup> Wherein the step of mapping all the values in **field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1**

can be operated, and through which all conventional database activities-searching, listing, adding, editing0can be supported, across all base-tables comprising the schema.

Furthermore, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses:

storing the third column in the database (Page 17, [0235], lines 12 – 15, Sandler; and Page 8, [0136], Kaufman).

Regarding Claims 2, and 23, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein identifying the similarities comprises:

determining a correlation value indicating a degree of correlation between the first and the second column (Page 2, [0018], lines 6 – 9, Sandler); and

determining whether the correlation value exceeds a predetermined threshold (Page 2, [0018], lines 6 – 9; is above a predetermined threshold; Sandler).

Regarding Claims 3, and 24, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the process further comprises:

if it is determined that the first and second column are correlated (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 12, Sandler), displaying an indication to a user that the first and second column can be merged (Page 1, and 2, [0008], and [0015], lines 1 – 5, and 4 – 7; respectively, Sandler); and

---

**1806** corresponds to the step of identifying the similarities between the first and second column as claimed.

in response to user input, merging the first and second column into a single column (Page 10, [0132], lines 2 – 8, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 4, and 25, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the first column is a column of a first database table and the second column is a column of a second database table, the process further comprising:

determining correlation attributes for N columns from the first database table and M columns from the second database table, where N and M are integers (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 12, Sandler);

comparing the correlation attributes from each of the N columns with the correlation attributes from each of the M columns to identify similarities between the N and M columns (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 12, all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806, Sandler); and

on the basis of the identified similarities, determining whether one or more of the N and M columns are correlated (Fig. 18A, Page 17, [0235], lines 12 – 15, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 5, and 26, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the process further comprises:

merging each of the one or more of the N and M columns determined to be correlated (Fig. 18A, items 1806, 1804, 1802, and 1810, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 15;



all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806 must be combined to **provide a value for field F 1810 in table TARGET 1802**, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 6, and 27, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the process further comprises:

determining, from the one or more database tables, metadata describing characteristics of each column (Page 4, [0056], lines 3 – 10, Sandler); and

wherein the correlation attributes are determined on the basis of the determined metadata (Page 18, [0251], lines 3 – 10, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 7, and 28, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the determined metadata describes for each column an attribute of a data value in the column (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 8 – 15, all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 8, and 29, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the determined metadata describes for each column at least one of:

- (i) a label;
- (ii) a comment;
- (iii) a constraint;

Art Unit: 2162

- (iv) a trigger;
- (v) a name (Page 9, [0116], lines 1 – 3, Sandler);
- (vi) a data type (Page 4, [0057], lines 10 – 12; data type, Sandler); and
- (vii) a column length (Page 4, [0057], lines 10 – 12; length of the columns, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 9, and 30, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the process further comprises:

determining, from the one or more database tables, statistical parameters associated with each of the columns (Page 4, [0059], lines 1 – 5, Sandler); and

wherein the correlation attributes are determined on the basis of the determined statistical parameters (Page 4, [0059], lines 5 – 9, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 10, and 31, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the determined statistical parameters describe for each column at least one of:

- (i) a minimum value (Page 4, [0059], lines 1 – 5; minimum; Sandler);
- (ii) a maximum value (Page 4, [0059], lines 1 – 5; maximum; Sandler);
- (iii) an average value; and
- (iv) a range of values (Page 4, [0059], lines 1 – 5; ... maintains a range indices for each key field column ... ; Sandler).

Regarding Claims 11, and 32, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the process further comprises:

determining, from the one or more database tables, ontological properties describing cognitive qualities associated with each column (Page 8, [0110], lines 3 – 9, Sandler); and

wherein the correlation attributes are determined on the basis of the determined ontological properties (Page 8, [0110], lines 3 – 9, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 12, and 33, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the determined ontological properties describe for each column at least one of:

- (i) a synonym (Page 8, [0110], lines 3 – 9; synonym table, Sandler);
- (ii) a parent node (Page 6, [0073], lines 9 – 14; Sandler); and
- (iii) an ancestor node (Page 6, [0073], lines 9 – 14; Sandler).

Regarding Claims 13, and 34, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the process further comprises:

determining, from the one or more database tables, metadata describing the ontological properties (Page 8, [0110], lines 3 – 9, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 14, and 35, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the process further comprises:

Art Unit: 2162

determining, from the one or more database tables, measurement units associated with each column (Page 4, [0059], lines 1 – 5, Sandler); and

wherein the correlation attributes are determined on the basis of the determined measurement units (Page 4, [0059], lines 5 – 9, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 15, and 36, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the process further comprises:

determining, from the one or more database tables, metadata describing the measurement units (Page 4, [0059], lines 1 – 5, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 16, and 37, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein identifying the similarities comprises:

determining whether the first and second column are associated with similar measurement units (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 12, all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 17, and 38, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable storage medium containing a program which, when executed, performs a process for identifying correlated columns from database tables, the process comprising:

Art Unit: 2162

determining metadata for at least two columns from one or more database tables, the metadata describing characteristics of each column (Page 4, [0056], lines 3 – 10, Sandler);

analyzing content from the at least two columns from the one or more database tables (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 12, all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806, Sandler); and

determining a degree of correlation between the at least two columns using the determined metadata and the analyzed content (Page 17 and 18, [0235] and [0251], lines 8 – 15 and 3 – 10; respectively, wherein the step of mapping by combining the same values in fields corresponds to the step of determining the degree of correlation as claimed; wherein the “many-to-one” corresponds to the metadata claimed; wherein the values in the fields corresponds to the analyzed content claimed; and wherein the mapping after combining the values, for example: value of the field F 1802, corresponds to the degree of correlation claimed; Sandler); and

storing the value representing the degree of correlation in the database (Page 17, [0235], lines 12 – 15, the value of the field F 1810 will be the sum of all of the elements in the field K1 1804 in table T1 1800 that have “A” as the value of field F1 1806).

Regarding Claims 18, and 39, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein determining the degree of correlation comprises:

assigning a first correlation value to the determined metadata (Page 9, [0122], line 1; one column is chosen as a field of values sources; Sandler);

assigning a second correlation value to the analyzed content, wherein the first and second correlation values are different (Page 9, [0123], and [0124], lines 1 – 6, and 1 – 2; respectively; Sandler); and

calculating a total correlation value on the basis of the first and second correlation values (Page 9, [0125], lines 1 – 4; ... distinct values in the column gets added to the result of (3); Sandler).

Regarding Claims 19, and 40, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the process further comprises:

merging the at least two columns if the total correlation value exceeds a predetermined threshold value (Page 2, [0018], lines 6 – 9; is above a predetermined threshold; Sandler).

Regarding Claims 20, and 41, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein analyzing the content comprises:

determining statistical parameters from the content of each column (Page 4, [0059], lines 1 – 5, Sandler).

Regarding Claims 21, and 42, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a computer readable medium, wherein the process further comprises:

Art Unit: 2162

merging the first and the at least one second column if it is determined that the first and at least one second column are correlated (Fig. 18A, items 1806, 1804, 1802, and 1810, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 15; all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806 must be **combined to provide a value for field F 1810 in table TARGET 1802**, Sandler).

Regarding Claim 43, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a data processing system, comprising a processor:

at least one database having one or more database tables (Page 2, [0016], lines 1 – 4, Sandler); and

a correlation manager for identifying correlated columns from the one or more database tables (Page 6, [0082], lines 3 – 6, Sandler), the correlation manager which, when executed by the processor, is configured for:

determining correlation attributes for a first column and a second column from the one or more database tables, the correlation attributes describing for each column at least one of the column and content of the column (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 12; wherein the step of mapping which includes all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806 corresponds to the step of determining the correlation attributes as claimed; wherein values F1 corresponds to the first column claimed; and wherein values in K1 corresponds to the second column claimed; Sandler);

comparing the correlation attributes from the first and second column (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 12, all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806, Sandler);

identifying similarities between the first and second column on the basis of the comparison (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 8 – 15, all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806, Sandler<sup>2</sup>);

on the basis of the identified similarities, determining whether the first and second column are correlated (Fig. 18A, Page 17, [0235], lines 12 – 15, “To perform this mapping, all of the values in field K1 1804 **that have the same values** in field F1 1806 must be combined...”; wherein “the same values” corresponds to the identified similarities claimed; Sandler);

upon determining the first and second columns are correlated, merging the first and second columns to create a third column (Fig. 18A, Page 17, [0235], lines 8 – 15, “To perform this mapping, all of the values in field K1 1804 **that have the same values** in field F1 1806 must be combined...”; wherein “the same values” corresponds to the identified similarities claimed; Sandler) that contains each data value stored in the first and second column (Fig. 5B, wherein the column “SECURITY\_GROUP\_USER” corresponds to the first column claimed, the column “PEOPLE” corresponds to the second column claimed, and wherein the “USER” column corresponds to the third column claimed, also note that



Art Unit: 2162

"USERS" column contains each data value stored in the first and second column, such as, "USERS\_KEY" and "PEOPLE\_KEY"; Page 8 – 9, [0134] – [0135], and [0139], Kaufman); and

storing the third column in the database (Page 17, [0235], lines 12 – 15, Sandler; and Page 8, [0136], Kaufman).

Regarding Claim 44, the combination of Snadler in view of Kaufman discloses a data processing system comprising a processor;

at least one database having one or more database tables (Page 2, [0016], lines 1 – 4, Sandler); and

a correlation manager for identifying correlated columns from the one or more database tables (Page 6, [0082], lines 3 – 6, Sandler), the correlation manager which, when executed by the processor, is configured for:

determining metadata for at least two columns from the one or more database tables, the metadata describing characteristics of each column (Page 4, [0056], lines 3 – 10, Sandler);

analyzing content from the at least two columns from the one or more database tables (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 – 12, all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806, Sandler); and

---

<sup>2</sup> Wherein the step of mapping all the values in **field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806** corresponds to the step of identifying the similarities between the first and second column as claimed.

determining a degree of correlation between the at least two columns using the determined metadata and the analyzed content (Page 17 and 18, [0235] and [0251], lines 8 – 15 and 3 – 10; respectively, wherein the step of mapping by combining the same values in fields corresponds to the step of determining the degree of correlation as claimed; wherein the “many-to-one” corresponds to the metadata claimed; wherein the values in the fields corresponds to the analyzed content claimed; and wherein the mapping after combining the values, for example: value of the field F 1802, corresponds to the degree of correlation claimed; Sandler); and

storing the value representing the degree of correlation in the database (Page 17, [0235], lines 12 – 15, the value of the field F 1810 will be the sum of all of the elements in the field K1 1804 in table T1 1800 that have “A” as the value of field F1 1806).

***Response to Arguments***

1. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "a correlation value **between two database columns and comparing that value to...**", "predetermined threshold for a correlation value", "using the metadata in order to **compute a value** corresponding to the degree of correlation between two columns") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

2. Applicant argues that; "the cited passage makes no use of a correlation value and furthermore, does not use metadata or analyzed content to computer such'a correlation value"

Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "...compute such a correlation value...") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Second, the applied art does disclose the limitation determining a degree of correlation between the at least two columns using the determined metadata and the analyzed content (See rejection of claims 17, 38, and 48 in this Office Action above).

***Conclusion***

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  
2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

***Prior Art Made Of Record***

1. Sandler et al. (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0217033 A1, filed: May 17, 2002).
2. Suzuki et al. (US Patent No. 6,044,383).


***Points Of Contact***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Giovanna Colan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2752. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Giovanna Colan  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2162  
September 10, 2007

  
JOHN BREENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100